

Comment Letter I75

Hingtgen, Robert J

From: snrhall@nethere.com  
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2014 3:03 PM  
To: Hingtgen, Robert J  
Subject: Fwd: Solar Farms in Boulevard

----- Forwarded message from [snrhall@nethere.com](mailto:snrhall@nethere.com) -----

Date: Tue, 11 Feb 2014 14:33:11 -0800

From: [snrhall@nethere.com](mailto:snrhall@nethere.com)

Reply-To: [snrhall@nethere.com](mailto:snrhall@nethere.com)

Subject: Solar Farms in Boulevard

To: [dianne.jacob@sdcounty.gov](mailto:dianne.jacob@sdcounty.gov), Mindy Fogg <[mindy.fogg@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:mindy.fogg@sdcounty.ca.gov)>, Ashley Gungle <[ashley.gungle@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:ashley.gungle@sdcounty.ca.gov)>, Bill Horn <[bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:bill.horn@sdcounty.ca.gov)>, Ron Roberts <[ron.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:ron.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov)>, Dave Roberts <[dave.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:dave.roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov)>

For decades the county has been adamant about water conservation in the back country. In the past they have denied certain types of projects, restricted the number of houses on properties, created limited lot sizes, restricted well drilling, and all in the name of protecting our water resources. The county has been protective of maintaining rural ambience and the community character.

Now all of the sudden, we have seen that in the last couple of years none of this seems to matter. The fact that the county is even considering these solar projects is proof of either corruption in the system or outright lack of knowledge of the overall effects to the community or its resources. How and what did it take to get the county to even consider these projects? Why the sudden abandonment of long held policies?

Research has shown that these projects use water at a rate of a factor of at least 3 over their projected use. The projected use of water for just the one solar project in Boulevard is an unacceptable amount of water draw on our cracked rock aquifer. These projects are drilling much lower than a residential well and use millions of gallons higher than residential use.

This will draw down the water level for residents forcing us to re-tap our wells in order to survive and live here, we can not just call the county and order more water. In addition, they have projected that they will be washing the solar panels once every 3 weeks. Again, we that live here in the dust and dirt are very well aware that we clean and dust more than that. So either they will be using more water than estimated or their production will be lower than anticipated.

They project Sung millions of gallons of water for construction, and millions more for ongoing operations. MILLIONS! How long does it take mother nature to replenish the aquifer? Has their been research to show how many years we have enough rainfall compared to those of drought to see if we can sustain our residents as well as the projects. Will they use less water in a drought like San Diego County residents are being asked to do? On our property we used to have springs that ran year around supporting our home as well as the wild life around us. Now they only run in very wet years.

In the last 10 years it's been 2 dry years to one wet year.

The result of approving this project will be the death of the oak trees, decline in our natural wildlife (some being protected birds such as the golden eagle) abandoned properties because people can not afford to re-tap their wells, the desertification of the mountain area and an end to our rural landscape and way of life. Which is why some of us have chosen to drive further to live as we do. Their has to be a different way to go green rather than just approving projects to meet a quota and getting in on the all mighty dollar for profit.

## Response to Comment Letter I75

Raymond Hall  
February 17, 2014

I75-1

This comment raises issues that have been considered and addressed in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR); see Chapters 2.5, Land Use, 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, and 3.1.9, Utilities. The County of San Diego agrees that revisions to the construction water demand estimate was required but not at a factor of at least 3 of the project use; please refer to common responses WR1 and WR2.

I75-2

Impacts to oaks and wildlife have been considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Section 2.3, Biological Resources. Impacts to groundwater have been considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Section 3.1.5, Hydrology and Water Quality, and common responses WR1 and WR2.

I75-1

I75-2

<p>Please consider if you were putting this in your backyard creating your home into an industrial zone. We implore you to stop not only the Boulevard Solar project but to look at the over all effects of the multiple projects being considered for our area.</p> <p>If you should have any further questions or would like to visit our ranch as we are going to be directly affected by this project, please feel free to call me at (519) 766-9374.</p> <p>Sincerely, Raymond Hall</p> <p>In addition my voting family members also agree with this letter. Shirley Hall Dwight Swinland Audra Burgio Chris Burgio</p> <p>----- End forwarded message -----</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p><b>I75-3</b> Cumulative impacts (i.e., the effects of the multiple projects being considered for the area) were considered and addressed throughout the DPEIR; see Chapters 2.0 and 3.0.</p>
--	---